



I hereby certify that the correspondence upon which
this notice is placed is being deposited with the US
Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to the Commissioner of Patents Washington,
D.C. 20231 on the date set forth below.
MOONRAY KOJIMA, ATTORNEY

1655
H3
B. Webb
8/25/01

IN THE US PATENT OFFICE

EXAMINER - Forman

GROUP - 1655

SN - 09/631,609

AMENDMENT

FILED - 8/4/00

AUG 21 2001

BY - Tanaami

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

SIRS:

Responsive to the Office Action of 7/19/01, applicant tentatively
elects the species designated by the Examiner as III, with claims
11-30 directed thereto.

The remaining claims 1-10 are non-elected, and are withdrawn
pending further prosecution. Applicant reserves the right to file
one or more divisionals thereon.

The election is made WITH TRAVERSE. It is believed that the
Examiner is in error.

As to claims 7-10, these claims recite the same invention
of claims 11-30, but differ in (a) breadth, and (b) language used.
Note, claim 7 (main claim) recites "... arranging sites", whereas
claim 11 (main claim) recites "arranging.. in arrays". Also, in
claim 7, we recite "depositing solutions..", whereas in claim 11,
we recite "deposited arrays". Thus, it is believed that,
the Examiner may have errored in considering differences in breadth
and language for difference in species.

As to claims 1-6, these claims recite further steps of
treatment on that which we have produced in the other claims.
We recite a further "amplifying" of "molecules previously prepared",

DATE
8/15/01

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

AUG 21 2001

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

such as may be done by the claims 7-30 methods. And then, "transcribing" the amplified molecules to other substrates", while maintaining the positional relationship. Thus, these claims operate on that which is provided by the other claims. It is believed that we are entitled to place in the same application, one step of a method, and then another step which can be built thereon, rather than having to file another application thereon.

However, applicant can understand splitting claims 1-6 from the other claims 7-30. But, claims 7-10 would be the same invention, insofar as the restriction requirement is concerned, since there, the question is of breadth and different terminology, not different inventions.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration of the restriction requirement for claims 1-6, as well as claims 7-10, but that in no event should claims 7-10 be considered different from claims 11-30. Examination and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully

M. KOJIMA

MOONRAY KOJIMA

BOX 627

WILLIAMSTOWN, MA 01267

Tel (413)458-2880

15 August 01